

~~SECRET~~

55

21st December, 1959.

COCOM Document 3715.23/2B

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

RECORD OF DISCUSSION

ON

ITEM 1523 - LINE COMMUNICATION TRANSMISSION EQUIPMENT

4th December, 1959

Present: Belgium(Luxembourg), Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, Netherlands, Turkey, United Kingdom, United States.

References: COCOM Docs. Nos. 3700.2 and 9, 3715.00/1, 3715.23/1 and W.P.1523/1.

1. The GERMAN Delegate stated that, in view of the discussions held during the first round of the review, his Delegation suggested that Item 1523 be changed as follows:

Heading: Delete the word "line"

Sub-item (a): Increase the cut-off to 36 Kc/s, delete the word "line" and add the following exclusion clause, "except stationary equipment designed for frequencies not higher than 108 Kc/s."

The Delegate explained that his Delegation were now proposing an exclusion for sub-item (a) only and had lowered the cut-off of "60 voice channels of 4 Kc/s each" to 12 channels, i.e. 108 Kc/s.

2. The UNITED KINGDOM Delegate was ready to accept the German proposal, but suggested that the number of channels should be indicated. The amended wording would be: "except stationary equipment designed for 24 channels with a frequency not higher than 108 Kc/s".

3. This change was supported by the German Delegate, and the FRENCH, JAPANESE and NETHERLANDS Delegates agreed to the German proposal as amended by the United Kingdom Delegation. The BELGIAN Delegate agreed to this text ad referendum, and the ITALIAN Delegate agreed to the German proposal ad referendum while reserving his position on the exception clause.

4. The UNITED STATES Delegate was able to agree to the editorial changes proposed and to the cut-off of 36 Kc/s. He could not, however, agree to the exclusion clause which, in his Delegation's view, would nullify the control applied under the rest of the definition.

5. The GERMAN Delegate was glad to see that the majority of delegations had supported his latest proposal, which had resulted from a compromise effort. The Delegate pointed out that the United States Delegation had recognised that the Bloc produced 12-24 channel equipment. Czechoslovakia had supplied Greece with equipment covered by Item 1523 necessary for their telephone system. The Delegate hoped that, in the light of the present discussion and in view of the almost unanimous agreement secured by the German proposal, the United States authorities would be able to reconsider their position.

6. The FRENCH Delegate added, in support of his German colleague's statement, that Hungary had supplied a South American country with equipment having 240 and 600 channels.

~~SECRET~~

SECRET

- 2 -

COCOM Document 3715.23/2B

7. The UNITED STATES Delegate underlined that exports made by Bloc countries were not sufficient to prove an adequacy for internal need but might be accounted for by economical factors - such as trade agreements - or political factors, such as motivate all Governments.

8. The GERMAN Delegate was not in the least convinced by the last argument put forward by the United States Delegate. It was more than unlikely that, if the Bloc were really suffering from a shortage of equipment vital to its defence, it would be ready to export such equipment to a country outside the Communist Bloc, and in particular to NATO countries. The Delegate therefore urged that his Delegation's proposal to exclude the least strategic types of equipment be accepted, and stressing again that this proposal had secured the support of all delegations but one, he hoped that the United States Delegation would be able to concur in the views expressed by the rest of the Committee.

9. The COMMITTEE agreed to resume discussion on the 14th December.

S E C R E T